Constance Werner Ramirez

A Summary History of the Army's Preservation Program

Although the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was passed in 1966, the historic preservation program for Army installations was developed primarily in response to specific federal agency tasks and deadlines in Executive Order (EO) 11593, signed by President Richard Nixon on May 13, 1971. Almost 100 years earlier, the Army, then the War Department, had been given responsibility for the management of Yellowstone National Park and later for many Civil War battlefields and sites designated as historic monuments. But after these properties were transferred to the National Park Service in the 1920s, the military conducted few formal preservation activities, and history was the domain of the Center for Military History and the Army museum program. With the NHPA and EO 11593, the Army was forced to consider its inventory of historic buildings and sites in whole new terms: integration of a preservation process into the maintenance, repair, alteration, use, demolition, disposal, and acquisition of all of its real property. Twenty-five years later and with lessons learned from hundreds of preservation activities, the Army has a comprehensive, nationwide preservation program.

Even before passage of the NHPA, the Army Corps of Engineers' civil works program had developed a preservation program in its district and division offices across the country. From its founding in 1802, the Corps had been given responsibility for many surveys that ultimately involved historic and cultural properties and management of national parks, landmarks, and battlefields. Then in 1879, the Corps' Geographical Surveys were abolished, and the practice of carrying out ethnological, archeological, and cultural resource surveys came to an end. The Bureau of the Budget (now OMB) decided in 1947 that only the National Park Service had the authority to budget for and conduct archeological investigations on federal civil works projects. In 1951, the Chief of Engineers requested the Park Service to administer the antiquities permit program on all Army lands. It was not until after the enactment of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 1970, that one district, Tulsa, added archeological expertise to its environmental resources staff. This resulted in Larry Banks, working as a geologist, to be given the position of Archeological Coordinator in September 1970.

In early 1971, while the Corps' military program was beginning to inventory historic properties on Army installations, the civil works program was discussing the role of the National Park Service and its authority to fund archeological investigations as part of Corps project costs. After EO 11593 was issued, the Corps decided that it could fund archeological work. In December of that year, the Tulsa District of the Corps of Engineers awarded the first archeological contracts to Wichita State University for surveys of Construction of Copan Dam and to Texas Archeological Research Laboratory for the Lake Texoma Restudy.

There continued to be disagreement among the Corps' Districts as to the role of the National Park Service in funding and carrying out surveys, but now there was also the growing awareness of the compliance requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA and its new regulations (36 CFR 800). Corps projects (undertakings, now), such as at Tahquitz Canyon and Warm Springs Dam in California, were delayed as staff learned new procedures. By the spring of 1974, the Corps' headquarters had begun meetings with archeologists and the National Park Service regarding funding responsibilities for compliance with NEPA. After the passage of Public Law 93-291, the Moss-Bennett Act, a task force was assembled to draft regulations for all civil works archeological and historic preservation activities. This meeting resulted in Engineering Regulation (ER) 1105-2-460, which in its revisions, guides the Corps of Engineers Civil Works Program in its cultural resource management responsibilities today.

Within a few years, the Corps of Engineers had hired over 20 archeologists and today has a cultural resources staff numbering over 70 archeologists and several historians, architects, and landscape architects.

Executive Order 11593, the Moss-Bennett Act, and NEPA also spurred the Corps' military

Glen DeGarmo, former preservation officer at Fort Bliss, and Fred Brieur, formerly at Fort Hood, in front of the Governor's Palace, Santa Fe, NM, 1977.

(Above right) John W. Morris and Dee Ann Story at the Environmental Advisory Board meeting in April, 1980. LTG Morris was Chief, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from 1976 to 1980.

program into action. In the first Army regulation on the environment, issued in 1974, a chapter was devoted to historic preservation. The emphasis was on identifying properties to be nominated to the National Register. When the field asked for assistance, the Military Programs Directorate in the office of the Assistant Chief of Engineers advertised for a contractor to write a technical manual on historic preservation. The contract was awarded to Parrish, Pine and Plavnick, a New York planning consulting firm with an office in Washington, run by Robert Plavnick, a well-known local government planner and an Army reservist. Having just worked with him on the preservation plans for Fort Myer, Virginia, and Fort McNair, DC, I then wrote *Technical Manual 5-801-1: Historic Preservation Administrative Procedures* and, a few months later, *Technical Manual 5-801-2: Historic Preservation Maintenance Procedures.* The final volume on archeological procedures never got written. At that time, no one seemed to have a clear picture of how the Army should manage its mostly unknown archeological sites. The two manuals set forth the structure, direction, guidance, and the level of technical information for the Army's program to the present.

In the meantime, many Army installations, such as Fort Leavenworth, were discovering that just forwarding information about their landmark buildings or districts to the National Register office did not satisfy the new compliance requirements. In 1976, the issue of the treatment of 19th-century buildings located on property acquired by the Army in the 20th century came to the attention of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. To bring the issue to the attention of the Army leadership, Robert Garvey, then Executive Director of the Council, recommended that the Council members meet on site to discuss compliance with the Army. With an agreement to protect the buildings from further deterioration, the Army's compliance program was born. Upon returning to Washington, the staff of the Buildings and Grounds Division of the Corps' military program moved rapidly to establish a consulting position for a historic preservation expert at headquarters. In January 1977, I accepted that position.

Issues, particularly concerning the Army's archeological resources, were emerging at a number of military bases and in the same year installations began hiring and contracting for assistance. At Fort Bliss, Texas, where an earlier survey of its missile range and one of its maneuver areas had located a large number of sites, Dr. Glen DeGarmo was hired. A few months later, Fort Hood, in central Texas, had hired Dr. Fred Brieur. Problems with sites on the Yakima training center at Fort Lewis, Washington, assigned extra duty to Major Robert Kavanagh, an anthropologist, to develop a historic preservation compliance program. The three largest of the Army's major commands responded to the problems at their installations by assigning responsibility for compliance to members of their real estate and engineering staffs. During this time, the Corps' civil works program had begun to hire archeologists at several of its district and division offices. By the spring of 1978, the beginnings of a core historic preservation staff had begun to develop in each of the Corps' programs and slowly a dialogue began between installations and districts regarding identification of historic properties.

The first meeting of this emerging group of historic preservation professionals occurred in the spring of 1978, when its members gathered at Woodlawn Plantation, outside Fort Belvoir, Virginia, to draft guidance for management of Army archeological resources. Over a three-day period, Larry Banks, Fred Brieur, Glen DeGarmo, Robert Kavanagh, Shirley Smith (FORSCOM), Odette Cranno (DARCOM), Larry Aten of the National Park Service, and I put together a strategy that tied level of risk to archeological sites to priority for inventory and treatment. In other words, the Army would identify those archeological sites most likely to be damaged by Army land uses (particularly tactical vehicle maneuvers) first and complete its other EO 11593 responsibilities second. Given funding, personnel, and priorities, triage would be the recommended policy. This approach was written up in an Army technical note (an Army policy interpretation document) and was followed by many installation cultural resources management programs for the next 15 years.

Despite the enthusiasm of the core group, most Army installations and commands believed that compliance with EO 11593 could be assigned to existing staff in the areas of real estate, facilities engineering, military housing, and, in a few places, to public affairs. As a consequence, there was a great need for training and the dissemination of information to all installations and major commands. Beginning with a small conference in the fall of 1977 in Washington, DC, the Army developed a series of annual or biennial workshops that brought together all Army personnel with responsibility for historic preservation compliance. In 1979, the Army sponsored a week-long historic preservation conference at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, TX. Over 100 people attended from installations and major commands and that number increased slightly through a series of similar workshops held roughly every two years, and in collaboration with the DoD, Navy, Air Force, and the Marine Corps through 1994. Since then, single-subject meetings, such as on curation, have been organized by one or more of the military departments.

Another early initiative that has continued is the organization of programmatic compliance activities. The first of these was the command-wide program initiated by Stan Fried, chief of real estate at the Army's Materiel Command (DARCOM), to survey and evaluate the buildings and archeological literature for 75 Army installations. DARCOM transferred funds to the National Park Service which contracted for a 2-volume report to be prepared, using a consistent format, for each of the installations in that command, the Army's arsenal, depot, and testing facilities. The cooperation with the National Park Service had been initiated previously for documentation of buildings at several Army installations and was to continue and expand in the 1980s.

With the enactment of the 1980 amendments to the NHPA, the Army realized that it needed to expand its policy guidance and to have a regulation devoted solely to historic preservation. The Army regulation was written and approved by the summer of 1983, and was finally printed and distributed a year later. Army Regulation 420-40, Historic Preservation, directed Army installations to fund and prepare historic preservation plans that would accomplish the requirements of the NHPA, as amended. It made a requirement of the guidance first issued in the technical manual on administrative procedures.

The programs in the other military departments of DoD began to take shape in the late 1970s. In May of 1979, the Navy hired Dr. John Bernard Murphy as a socio-economic planner to develop the historic preservation program for the Navy. Meanwhile, the Air Force natural resources staff at Tyndal Air Force Base, Florida, had begun providing Air Force bases with technical assistance in archeology and historic preservation. By 1982, Air Force headquarters had assigned historic preservation to one of its officers. A year later, Dr. A. Ludlow Clark, fresh from MX missile-Native American negotiations, took the natural and cultural resources staff position at Air Force headquarters at Bolling AFB in Washington, DC. Finally, in 1984, DoD hired Christina Ramsey to work in the office of the DoD Director of Environmental Policy. Under her leadership, the natural and cultural resources staff of the four military services were coordinated, primarily through the Natural Resources Committee and its subcommittee on cultural resources, later to become the Defense Cultural Resources Committee (DCRC). In 1985, DoD distributed a new directive that laid out the requirements for the military departments in cultural resources, very similar to the Army regulation. A year later, DoD sponsored the first tri-service workshop on historic preservation in Williamsburg, VA, and thereafter, the workshops begun by the Army were organized through the DCRC. With the close of 1985, the Army's program had the major elements that were to be developed for the next 10 years.

The years between 1985 and 1991 cover a period of rapid program development. Major commands and installations began to obtain historic preservation and archeology staffs. The construction at Fort Irwin in the California Mojave Desert, Pinon Canyon in southeastern Colorado, and Fort Drum in upstate New York focused attention on the installations' needs for technically-competent cultural resources staff. Also the Corps of Engineers' district offices continued to increase their cultural resources (primarily archeology) staffs and took on a larger role in supporting installations and major command cultural resources projects. Paul McGuff at Fort Worth District and Horace Foxall at Seattle District began programs to support the total Army program, in cultural resources planning and historic building maintenance, respectively.

The 1980s also saw Congress and DoD begin to look at opportunities to reduce the maintenance and repair budgets for military installations. Directions came down that concerned World War II temporary buildings and historic family housing units. With the request from Congress in 1983 to DoD to demolish most of its World War II temporary real property, a nationwide programmatic compliance project was initiated. The Army was assigned the lead for DoD on a Programmatic Agreement for the documentation of a representative sample of approximately 40,000 World War II

temporary buildings (all of which might be eligible for listing on the National Register as a multiple property nomination) with the Advisory Council and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. Ten years later, this effort had resulted in several volumes of documentation and history of military temporary buildings and an exhibit at the National Building Museum in Washington, DC, on the impact of World War II designs and construction on the American homefront.

Another mid-1980s program undertaken at the request of Congress was a study and plan for reducing the costs of maintaining the historic houses, or family quarters, on DoD installations. Each military department undertook its own project, and the Army selected 2,006 housing units in quarters listed on the National Register (approximately 40% of the family housing quarters that met the criteria of the National Register and roughly 2% of the total number of Army family housing units). Detailed histories and building condition analyses were used as the basis for estimating one-time repair costs and 25-year maintenance requirements. In the Army's report to Congress and the subsequent historic preservation plan for the historic quarters at Fort McNair in Washington, DC, and Forts Myer and Belvoir in Virginia, the Army approached the issue of treatment of similar historic properties united by a national military historic context and subject to current budget guidance that did not differentiate for National Register properties.

In addition to the support by the Corps of Engineers' district offices, the Corps also supported the growing cultural resources program through its research laboratories. The Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi, primarily through the work of Roger Saucier, had taken particular interest in the problems of management of archeological sites in water resources projects. In 1969, the Corps established the Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (CERL) in Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, to address issues of installation management, and by the 1980s it, too, was recognizing the need to work on cultural resources management problems. Through the interest of Dr. Diane Mann, anthropologist, and Dr. Louis R. Shaffer, technical director of CERL, the laboratory began a cultural resources research and development program. Beginning with the problem of developing a computer-based information management system for archeological sites, and then expanding into one-for-all cultural resources, CERL developed CRIS, the Cultural Resources Information System. This led the Army to look at the issue of computerized preservation planning systems. When the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York, was interested in developing such a plan, it entered into an agreement with the Advisory Council to develop a prototype. Thanks to the work of John Cullinane, AIA, the Council's senior architect, the Army learned a lot about developing installation preservation plans. This experience, with the work on CRIS, was used by CERL to develop XCRIS, a graphic user interface integrating GISs, DBMSs, text-editing, and report generation with on-line compliance guidelines that could provide a cultural resource manager with a dynamic planning and decision-making tool. CERL also undertook the nationwide survey of World War II temporary military buildings, development of prototypes and standards for both archeological and historic landscape and building surveys, and the application of many materials analysis processes to cultural resources. It also entered into partnerships with other research programs, such as the universities of Arkansas and California, to bring their expertise to the service of the Army. Through CERL's Cultural Resources Research Center, under the direction of Keith Landreth, the Army could address the technical issues critical to a cost-effective preservation compliance and stewardship program.

By the end of the 1980s, the Army's cultural resources program contained the components of a mature government program. There was a policy document, technical guidance, a research and development capability, contracting experience, a range of precedent compliance documents with the Advisory Council and with the SHPOs, a schedule of regular training conference-workshops, and a growing list of completed field projects in documentation, survey, planning, maintenance, and management issues. In November 1988, the program was recognized when the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Housing was presented with a National Historic Preservation Honor Award from the Advisory Council and the Department of the Interior. The only piece missing was consistent budget guidance and funding.

The Army's cultural resources program was in place but its low priority and constant fight for funds resulted in sporadic progress. Then late in 1990, Congress appropriated $10 million to the DoD to set up a Legacy Resource Management Program to augment the work in natural and cultural resources. This unexpected shot in the arm has resulted in DoD funding more work in cultural resources in the last six years, about $85 million, than in its whole program before 1990. Across the United States on installations of all sizes, the cultural resources program has achieved many of its objectives. Requirements of NAGPRA, of 36 CFR

79, and of NHPA Section 110 have been funded through the Legacy program. Training materials, workshops, and various meetings have brought up-to-date information to installation personnel. Brochures, reports, and videotapes are telling the story of the Army's history and its stewardship of historic properties. Policy studies have identified and provided background for guidance documents on the treatment of Cold War historic properties, cultural resources management plans, and DoD's role in the protection of historic properties outside the United States. The use of central funding techniques versus decentralized funding has more clearly shown where each is most effective. Partnerships have been formed with national and local historic preservation organizations that have multiplied the public benefit of Army investments in cultural resources compliance. By the mid-1990s, the second generation of the Army's cultural resources management program was underway.

Nevertheless, cultural resources must ultimately enhance the readiness and military mission of the Department of the Army. Without a public recreation or historic property interpretation mission, the Army must manage its historic properties in terms of the contribution that they can make to national security. A study by the Department of the Navy, on behalf of DoD, identified seven specific benefits to the military of cultural resources. Besides the savings by re-use of existing historic facilities and enhancement of the quality of life on military installations, the study pointed out that the qualities of readiness now most needed in the theater were exemplified in the installations' historic places: understanding of different and changing cultural values, adaptation of existing facilities, exploitation of technology for information, respect for tradition and places hallowed by human activity, and a reminder that each soldier is part of a long and proud history of service to the United States. By fully integrating cultural resources management into the military mission, they become assets that strengthen the defense of this democracy.

Constance Werner Ramirez is Director, Cultural, Environmental, and Accessibility Programs, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration. From 1977 to 1995, she directed the historic preservation program of the Department of the Army.

Information about the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works program was provided by Larry Banks, formerly Chief Archeologist, Corps of Engineers Southwestern Division.

Taj Mahal, from cover

Casting a long shadow over Washington Circle is the majestic Taj Mahal (current Building 100) which rises 170 feet into the air at Randolph Field near San Antonio, TX. The origins of the name are unknown, but the distinctive appearance of the building clearly reminded someone of the original Taj Mahal, and the name stuck. First Lieutenant Harold L. Clark, the architect of the air city that was Randolph, came up with the idea of a decorative domed structure to encase the water tower that was usually so obtrusive at most airfields. In doing so, he also devised a scheme to centralize a considerable number of functions in a single large post administration building at the base of the tower. Completed in 1931 at a cost of $252,000, the Taj came to house not only a 500,000-gallon water tank but the signal office, a photographic unit, the post office, the telephone exchange, a print plant, a weather office, the judge advocate's office and courtroom, and administrative offices of the Quartermaster, as well as the personnel, finance, recruiting, and public relations offices. In addition, the rear wing contained a movie theater and auditorium that had a seating capacity of 1,150 people. On the second floor were the offices of the Randolph Field and the Air Corps Training Center commanders. Over six decades later, many of those functions still remain in the Taj.

Launch Complex 33, U.S. Army White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, was designated a National Historic Landmark in October 1985. Photo courtesy U.S. Army Public Affairs Office.